

THIS OPINION WAS NOT WRITTEN FOR PUBLICATION

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DAVID E. KRONK

Appeal 2007-0230
Application 09/506,676
Technology Center 2100

Decided: April 30, 2007

Before KENNETH W. HAIRSTON, HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP,
and MAHSHID D. SAADAT, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a final rejection of claims 21 to 31. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

Appellant has invented a system and method for controlling a plurality of equipment having different user interfaces based on an open client-server architecture. Each user interface can provide messages for controlling each of the plurality of equipment.

Claim 21 is representative of the claims on appeal, and it reads as follows:

21. A system for controlling a plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment having different user interfaces based on an open client-server architecture for golf courses, ski resorts, other outdoor recreational areas or for any application involving and managing of an outdoor environment, comprising:

client or user interfaces for providing messages for controlling the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment, and receiving responses containing information about the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment;

client or user interface messaging controls, each associated with a respective one of the client or user interfaces;

interface control servers, each for controlling a respective one of the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment; and

interface control server messaging controls, each associated with a respective one of the interface control servers, the interface control server messaging controls and the client or user interface messaging controls exchanging messages and communicating with each other using a common messaging control protocol for controlling the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment, each messaging control being usable for communication with at least two or more messaging controls in the system so that each client or user interface can provide messages for

controlling each of the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment, and also can receive responses containing information about each of the plurality of outdoor environmental maintenance equipment.

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Gray	US 5,568,402	Oct. 22, 1996
Smith	US 6,192,282 B1	Feb. 20, 2001
		(filed Sep. 30, 1997)

The Examiner rejected claims 21 to 26 and 29 to 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based upon the teachings of Smith.

The Examiner rejected claims 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the teachings of Smith and Gray.

Appellant contends that the system described by Smith has a central controller 13, and that the system lacks “multiple client or user interfaces that each provide messages for controlling each of the outdoor environmental maintenance equipment” (Br. 6).

We sustain.

ISSUE

Does Smith describe a plurality of user interfaces that can each provide messages for controlling each of the plurality of equipment?

FINDINGS OF FACT

Appellant describes a control system in which each of the user interfaces 16, 36, and 52, for example, can provide messages via messaging controls 20, 40, and 56, respectively, to control each of the plurality of equipment 24, 46, 68, and 74 in the system (Figure 1; Specification 8).

Smith describes a system for controlling a myriad of equipment (Figure 1). A plurality of user interfaces exist throughout the system (col. 9,

ll. 42 to 44; col. 10, ll. 19 and 20; col. 15, ll. 7 to 52), and each of the user interfaces issues commands through the central controller 13 to control each of the plurality of equipment.

Gray was applied by the Examiner for its teaching of a user interface that “includes a system control and data acquisition (SCADA) having a messaging control arranged therein (*see col. 3, lines 14-39*)” (Answer 10).

PRINCIPLE OF LAW

Anticipation is established when a single prior art reference discloses expressly or under the principles of inherency each and every limitation of the claimed invention. *Atlas Powder Co. v. IRECO Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1946 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

ANALYSIS

Appellant acknowledges that each of the user interfaces in Smith can control each of the pieces of equipment by issuing commands via the central controller 13 (Br. 9). Nothing in the claims on appeal precludes each of the user interfaces from operating through the central controller to control each of the pieces of equipment. Thus, Smith has a teaching of each of the user interfaces controlling each of the pieces of equipment in the system.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Anticipation has been established by the Examiner because the system described by Smith teaches that each of a plurality of user interfaces controls each of a plurality of equipment.

DECISION

The anticipation rejection of claims 21 to 26 and 29 to 31 is affirmed. The obviousness rejection of claims 27 and 28 is affirmed because the Appellant has not presented any patentability arguments for these claims apart from the arguments presented for claim 21.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 CFR § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

tdl

Ware Fressola Van Der Sluys & Adolphson, LLP
Bradford Green, Bldg. 5
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468